

Judicial Council of California
Center for Families, Children & the Courts / Operations and Programs Division

ACCESS TO VISITATION GRANT PROGRAM

RFP Grant Application Questions and Responses

The questions and answers are from **August 21, 2014, through August 28, 2014** regarding the Access to Visitation Grant Program RFP Grant Application for Fiscal Years 2015–2016 through 2017–2018 funding. The *RFP Grant Application Questions and Responses* are set forth in categories to help facilitate the applicants review and completion of the grant application proposal.

To ensure a fair process, applicants are reminded that communications regarding the RFP grant application after closure of the applicant’s teleconference calls must be submitted by e-mail to shelly.labotte@jud.ca.gov. Telephone assistance cannot be provided. Additionally, Access to Visitation Grant Program staff will post applicant questions (and staff responses) every Thursday through August 28, 2014. Please visit the CFCC website to download other RFP Grant Application Questions and Answers previously submitted: <http://www.courts.ca.gov/cfcc-accesstovisitation.htm> (click on RFP Information section).

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION & FORMATTING QUESTIONS

1. Question: Is the table of contents included in the 29 page limitations, or like the cover page and budget forms, it’s not counted? Also, I didn’t see anywhere in the narrative where the qualifications of the agency (years of operation/history) could be included. Is that important for the people who will be rating the grant proposals?

Response:

- (A) No, table of contents is not part of the 29 page limitation.
- (B) The qualifications of the agency is not a specific narrative question but the applicant may want to consult other questions in the proposal narrative section that may be susceptible to describing or including years of operation/history information for purpose of completion of the grant application proposal.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

2. Question: We will be contracting with the XXX Superior Court to provide the access to visitation services. Is the subcontractor agency allowed then to subcontract with another 501(3)c in order to provide a second location for safe exchanges visits. The safe exchanges conducted at this second location would basically be a part of the courts Access to Visitation Grant program that is in existence but the staff and location would be provided by the second 501(c)3?

Response:

- (A) The way the grant operates is that the applicant court is the lead administering court and enters into a contract agreement with the Judicial Council. The applicant court subsequently enters into a contract and/or MOU agreement with their local subcontractor. The Access to Visitation Grant Program can only accept the RFP grant application proposals from the superior court/s.
- (B) Based on the information above, if the courts proposed Access to Visitation Grant Program is to include several subcontractors, then the applicant court would enter into a contract agreement and/or MOU agreement with the two subcontractor agencies (non-profit entities).
- (C) On the courts budget form, the court would include two subcontractors under the "Consultant/Contractual" budget line item. Each subcontractor would be required to meet all state and federal grant requirements.
- (D) The grant program does not permit (with rare exception) the local subcontractor (your agency) to enter into "consultant/contractual services" with another subcontractor agency (non-profit)—only the superior court is permitted to do this. So if the courts proposed plan is to offer services at two different site locations through two separate nonprofit agencies, then the court would enter into a contractual agreement with both subcontractors and propose such as part of their Access to Visitation Grant implementation plan.

BUDGET QUESTIONS

- 3. Question: We are having some big formatting issues with the subcontractor budget sheets. I downloaded the "Word Version" but the formatting won't cooperate with where I have to put the numbers. Is anyone else struggling with this, or do you know of a "fix". We understand we are not to change any of the formatting of the documents.

Response: To date, no court has reported any formatting issues with the court/subcontractor budget forms. However, we reviewed the documents and it looks like that one table may not be a real table where you can enter information but more like "clip art" so we have revised and replaced Appendix C on the CFCC website as of August 27, 2014.

- 4. Question: One of our potential subcontractors/partners for the Access to Visitation Program RFP has a "self-pay" option for clients who do not qualify for grant funded supervised visitation services. In other words, these clients pay for 100% of their supervised visitations, and are not supported in any way by grant funds. This option is available to clients who are not referred into the AOC Access to Visitation program by the bench. The fee is \$50 p/hr (which is substantially lower than private providers in our area, who charge upwards of \$120-\$140 p/hr). All of the fees collected from the self-pay option for supervised visitation services are used to pay for supervised visitation monitor's time and benefits. The fees do not even cover other direct costs. Those costs are paid for by the agency through other grant funds. We would like to incorporate this subcontractor into our RFP so that we can move some of those clients who are paying for the service and who are indigent or low income, to receive free supervised visitation services under this grant program. However, the amount we are budgeting for this agency

will not pay for all the clients currently utilizing the self-pay option. This is one of the only low-cost supervised visitation programs in our area, and the court would like to see them continue to provide valuable, low-cost services to our indigent population. Can the court contract with this agency for, let's say, an amount of \$5000 and still allow the agency to provide an affordable self-pay option to non-grant funded clients as part of a separate self-pay program? Would we have to report the fees they collect as part of this self-pay program as "Program Income," even though it is not part of the AOC Access to Supervised Visitation grant program?

Response:

- (A) If the court is subcontracting with the agency, either through subsidized funding or as self-pay option, the court's subcontractor would be receiving Access to Visitation Grant funding and so the subcontractor agency would be considered part of the Access to Visitation Grant Program (i.e., your example stated the court would pay say \$5000 to the agency) .
- (B) Program income is viewed as any income generated from the Access to Visitation grant activity (e.g., fees for service). Program income may mean income or money from clients participating in the grant program. Court/subcontractors should carefully review section 45 CFR 92.25 for additional guidance regarding program income requirements
http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/cfr_2004/octqtr/pdf/45cfr92.25.pdf
- (C) Staff time would not be reimbursable under the Access to Visitation Grant Program if program staff is not working on the grant program.
- (D) Based on the scenario above, if the client became an "AV client" and enrolled in the self-pay option or if fees are being generated as a result of an Access to Visitation Grant activity, then the fees would be considered program income.